

COBBETT'S WEEKLY REGISTER.

VOL. 43.—No. 10.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 7, 1822. [Price 6d.

Published every Saturday Morning, at Six o'Clock.

TO

MR. CANNING.

*On his Farewell-Meeting at
Liverpool, on the 30th of
August 1822.*

“Nay, answer me not with a fool-
born jest.” HEN. IV.

Kensington, 4 Sept. 1822.

SIR,

You are about to be shipped off to a country of tax-collectors and slaves; to a country of Aumils, of Zemindars, and of Ryots; that is to say, of Farmers-General of taxes; of Under-renters of taxes; and of poor devils of Husbandmen, whose *very fields* are guarded by the bayonet, until all the crop has been taken away, except what is absolutely necessary to keep the labourer alive and in a condition to toil. A country, where the land is tilled by miserable beings, who are the *property* of others, who are themselves but slaves. Where the greater part

of the people are liable to be sold, mortgaged, or let to hire, precisely like the live-stock of a farm. But, in the whole of that country, extensive as are its limits and numerous as are its people, you will never see a crew of creatures half so base as those by whom you were, the other day, surrounded at Liverpool.

The Meeting was, it would appear, for the ostensible purpose of giving you a *farewell-treat*; you being, as it is said, and as you seem to confess, sentenced to go to Hindostan. The *pretence* was, that you were the *Representative* of the town; but the whole of the proceedings exhibit you in the light of a *Mountebank*, surrounded by a crowd of stupid admirers; though, in reality, they were a set of mean creatures, taking this opportunity of paving the way to their getting at a share in what they think you will have to bestow of the good things of India. It was quite in character for you to represent the “*address*” of these sycophants together with their

T

Printed and published by C. CLEMENT, No. 183, Fleet-street.

nine times nine cheers (similar to those given to *Parson Hay*) as natural effusions of their *gratitude* and *affection*. It was quite in character for you to affect to be *melted*, and to be thrown into a sort of blubbering hiccup by these, as you called them, "marks of *kindness*;" but, the public well know, that those cheers, being interpreted, were a *howl* after that prey, that spoil, by which the cheerers intend, through your means, to fatten themselves or their broods; while, on your part, the whole thing was manifestly intended as a break to your fall; as a means of getting you off the stage with a *clap*; aye, just such an one as is obtained at Covent Garden or Old Drury by *tickets given away* to the Cyprian Damsels and to the Knights of the Pad.

At this Meeting, as on the stage, a *speech* from the head operator always makes a part of the performance. With your speech, upon this occasion, it shall now be my business to deal; first, however, giving a list, as far as I find it published, of the mean and false creatures that addressed and cheered you. It is necessary to observe, that there was a *previous Meeting* on the 23d of August, at which you dined with those hacks who constitute what is called "*the*

Canning Club;" and this Meeting must not be passed over in silence. Here that prince of stupidity and servility, *John Gladstone*, appears to have been *Chairman*; and, to give the public the means of judging correctly of the character of this *more select crew*, it is only necessary to state, that one of the toasts from the Chair was, "*The Manchester Magistrates*." At this "*Canning Club*" Meeting there appears to have been a man of the name of *Gifford*, who sang a song, called "*Forget me not*." Was this that *William Gifford*, who, the son of a cobbler at Ashburton in Devonshire, and put to school out of charity by a parson of the name of Cookson, became in time, travelling tutor to Lord Belgrave (now Earl Grosvenor); who about 1798, became *Editor*, under you and others, of that most libellous of all publications, the *Anti-Jacobin Newspaper*; who, for this service, had in 1799, a sinecure given him of 329*l.* a-year, and was soon after made a *Commissioner of the Lottery besides*; who has thus been receiving, out of the taxes, about 600*l.* a-year, from that day to this, and who, of course, has received, in this way, of *principal money*, about 14,000*l.*? Was this that *Gifford*? And did he, by

the song, "*Forget me not*," want you to give him, or get him, some more *sinecures*? Or, was the song in *behalf of the whole crew*? This *Gifford* got a good horse-whipping from Peter Pindar, in 1800. Peter had, in a poem called "*A Cut at a Cobbler*," lashed the mercenary reptile. The latter, unable to answer, accused Pindar of *unnatural propensities*! This brought him, not a literary, but a *literal lashing*, to the great enjoyment of the whole town. This man is said to be the whipper-in of that last shift of tyranny, the *Quarterly Review*. He may be assured, that, if you should *forget him*, the public will not: they will not, when the day of settlement comes, forget his *sinecures* any more than they will *yours*.

At the Second Meeting, the grand mountebank exhibition, one *J. B. Hollinshead* is given as the *Chairman*. The following is given as the names of those who *addressed* you. It is, and especially may be, of great *use* to have these *names* ready to turn to. Every man of these must be taken to be an *abettor* of you and your associates, and as having done every thing in his power in the *cause of the Manchester Magistrates*. Here we have these men, then, from their own account of them-

selves:—George Irlam, Chair—Charles Lawrence, Deputy Chair, of the Association of West India Planters and Merchants.—Alexander M'Gregor, Chair—Wm. Rathbone, Deputy Chair, American Chamber of Commerce.—Thos. Case, Chair—Jos. Sanders, Deputy Chair, Underwriters' Association.—Rob. Gladstone, Chair.—Thos. Leathom, Deputy Chair, Ship Owners' Association.—John Carter, Chair—Nicholas Robinson, Deputy Chair, Corn Exchange Association.—Thomas F. Dyson, Chair—Rich. Harrison, Deputy Chair, Portugal, Brazil, South American, and Mexican Association.—Rob. Benson, Chair—Jos. Hibberson, Deputy Chair, East India Association.—Francis Jordan, Chair—David Hodgson, Deputy Chair, Irish Association.—Rob. Gladstone, Chair—Thos. Moore, Deputy Chair, Baltic Association.

There let the vermin stand for the present, while I proceed to comment on your mountebank harangues. There are *two* of these also, the first being of as much importance, for my present purpose, as that delivered on the grand stage on the 30th. I shall consider the two as one, and shall take up, in the following order, the topics they present:—

1. *Catholic Emancipation*; 2. *Reform of Parliament*; 3. *Policy with regard to Foreign Nations*; 4. *Distress of the Country*; 5. *Your Approaching Exile*.

I could, in a very short compass, state, and fairly state, the meaning of all that you said on these several topics. And I am sure, too, that I should not be accused of foul play; of misrepresenting or of garbling. But I do not choose to put your mountebank harangues before the public in this way. I choose to take your words, as uttered, or rather, as written out, by you, and published by your creatures; because one part of my object is, to show that you are a poor trifling thing; that you may, perhaps, be fit for a Mountebank, Play-Actor, or something of that sort; but that you are wholly unfit to be entrusted with the management of any part of the nation's affairs. With this object in view I shall here insert your harangues, divided into parts corresponding with the afore-mentioned division; and shall, of course, begin with what you say with regard to *Catholic Emancipation*.

1. CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.—“On the subject of Catholic Emancipation I am well aware; and in the first speech which I had the honour of addressing to you

“in Liverpool, I candidly declared that I had the misfortune of differing from those with whom I was in the habit of generally agreeing on political subjects; and I told my Constituents, that in accepting me as their Representative, they elected one who supported, and would not abate a single jot of his anxiety or exertions for the success of that question.—(Cheers.)—Accordingly I have taken every opportunity of most strenuously supporting the question of Catholic Emancipation in whatever modification it has been discussed. I dealt honourably with you on that occasion; and though I have rarely given an opinion which was not that of my Constituents also, I feel pleasure in knowing that upon that occasion I spoke the general sense of the country. I have not in any instance compromised your rights; I have gone forward in what I conceive to be the straight path of duty, and neither here nor elsewhere have I reason to repent of my perseverance.—(Loud cheers.)—Were I to remain in this country; and again represent you in the House of Commons, I should pursue the same course, no matter what uneasiness it might give me to differ in opinion from those friends whom I so highly respect. I, however, think, and as I shall not, perhaps, have an opportunity of stating it elsewhere, I am anxious to take this time to mention it, that after the struggle which has been made upon the question for the last ten years, I should, as an individual, be inclined to advise that it should be treated as a question of compromise, rather than one of an unqualified nature, as it has hitherto been argued. I feel as deeply and as anxiously now for the success of this question as I did at any former period of my life. But upon grounds of poli-

“tical expediency, and looking to the peace of the country, I confess I should be ready to accept what I think by a compromise might be obtained, adjourning, but never abandoning those points which I conceive to be at present matters of hopeless litigation. In the House of Commons I should perhaps have hesitated to express those opinions, because there is a salutary jealousy entertained by the public at any change of opinion by a public man; a jealousy which makes it safer to pursue what is hopeless, rather than seek to obtain what by a compromise might be had, and thereby subject one's conduct to public misconstruction. But I say it here, for here no suspicion of improper motives can attach to the declaration. I hinted at this in the course of recent debates. I was anxious to preserve the peace of the country; I wished that we should have breathing time; I wished to remove one great cause of discussion and complaint, reserving for a future period the introduction and accomplishment of that more complete arrangement; of which, I, for one, shall never forego the expectation.”

This is as slippery and as mean and beggarly a piece of stuff as ever escaped the lips of place-hunter. What you thought was, that the people would not understand this; that neither those who were listening to you, nor those in general who would read what you were saying; you thought that these would not understand you; but that the *Lord Chancellor would!* He will understand you clearly enough; but he knows

well that you can bring to the Ministry nothing but *weakness*, of which it has quite enough already.

As to the question of Catholic Emancipation, it never has been a question with any of you: it has been a stalking-horse; a thing to intrigue with and about; but he must be a dreadful fool indeed, who thinks that the humouring of a score or two of Catholic families would have the smallest tendency towards making the Irish nation happy and contented. To make the Irish nation happy and contented, the millions must be well off; and will the humouring of a score or two of families with seats and offices make the Irish nation well off? But what would your scheme have effected? Would the enabling of about twenty Lords to sit in Parliament have done any thing for the people of Ireland? And how shall we describe the impudence or ignorance of a man, who could give to such a measure the name of Catholic Emancipation? Who would it have emancipated; who would it have set free?

Here is a country with a Catholic people and a Protestant hierarchy. The people are compelled to pay tithes to the priests of a religion that they detest. The bishoprics and the livings are

enormous sinecures, and the tithes are collected in that sort of way which makes them doubly odious and burdensome. Every farthing's worth of them is grudged to the receiver. There needs no other cause of discontent, sedition, rebellion, sunset and sunrise laws, enormous military expenditure, starvation amidst abundance, and all the evils that can afflict a country. And you, mighty politician, have, as a remedy for this unparalleled mass of evils, the passing of a law to enable a dozen or two of Catholic peers to sit in the House of Lords! *Betty Canning* of old, famed in ballad, could not have thought of any thing more absurd and contemptible; and the ground of astonishment is, that you can have lived in England to the year 1822, and not be ashamed to talk of such a thing as a remedy for any evil whatever; that you can see immense sums of money voted out of the taxes of England, to prevent the Irish people from starving in the midst of abundance; that you can see whole parishes of Catholics prepared for death by their priests, on account of want of food, while enormous quantities of food are daily shipped out of the country, and that you can talk of slipping a dozen or two of Ca-

tholic peers into the House of Lords, as a means of restoring peace and happiness to Ireland!

Emancipated, indeed, the Irish want to be, and ought to be; but it is *from the Protestant Hierarchy*; from tithes, from tithe-proctors, from spiritual Courts, and all the powers of a Church; that takes from the fruit of the land, not less than from two to three millions. This is the emancipation that the Irish want. In one word, they want to get rid of tithes; and the existence of the tithes, and that alone, it is that prevents all those emancipation things that you affect to be driving after. It is not the Pope; it is not Anti-Christ, as our Parsons call him; it is not the "Aud Whoore," as the Scotch Parsons call him; it is not images and wafers and saints in calendar; it is not any of these, that the opposers of your emancipations care about: it is the two millions a year of *Church property*, as they call it, that they have in their eye, and that a Reformed Parliament would so soon put to rights. This is what they care about; and this you must know, too, or you are blinder than any buzzard that ever run his head into the net of the fowler.

Your propositions about Ca-

tholic Emancipation, as you call it, show you, therefore, to be a driveller, or a man of very great insincerity. But, we have in this speech of yours, something a great deal more interesting than any of your Parliamentary propositions. We have you here making a confession of your *readiness to compromise!* Never was a more direct begging for place than this. You knew well that your conduct with regard to this Catholic Emancipation had *offended the most powerful persons in the Ministry.* You had not forgotten the open, the undisguised hostility of the Chancellor, and the famous good rap he gave you upon the knuckles. The truth is this: you were mortified: they were sending you away: you wished to remain: and, at any rate, you were determined to give them a slap at parting. Your motion was well calculated to embarrass them: it did embarrass them; and the Chancellor gave you a rap by way of punishment. NOW, owing to the adventure at North Cray, you hope to obtain a *respite.* You hope, in short, to be able to stay at home, and to have place, too. NOW, therefore, you "*confess,*" that you should be ready to *accept of a compromise!* But, let us have the

words, let us have the begging again: "I confess I should be ready to accept what I think by a *compromise* might be obtained, *adjourning,* but never abandoning those points which I conceive to be at present *matters of hopeless litigation.*" —And this, because you are "*anxious to preserve the peace of the country.*" Why did you not think of this, when you *divided the House,* during the last session? You did "*hint at it.*" When? How? Never that I perceived. No: and you now, from your mountebank stage, make the offer to the Ministers, if they will take you in; that is to say, if they will take you in, you will, not "*abandon,*" oh, no! but "*adjourn,*" Catholic Emancipation *for ever;* or, at least, to the day before the day of judgment!

And, yet, the fools that heard you were to entertain "*no suspicion of improper motives,*" because you did not make the offer of compromise *in Parliament!* Just as if the mountebank stage were not a fitter place for it! Just as if, too, there were *nothing in the time!* Just as if any man of common sense could fail to perceive, that this was an offer of *submission* made to the Ministers, in consequence of the exit of the

hero of North Cray! Once more, I tell you, the offer is in vain. It is not *weakness*; it is not *unpopularity*, that the Ministers want. They have enough of both; and must, therefore, be mad indeed, if they accept of you.

2. REFORM OF PARLIAMENT.—

You dwelt longer on this topic than on any of the others; and you seem to have mustered up for the occasion all the sophistry that you are master of. Not to fatigue the attention of the reader, I shall take this part of your speech a portion at a time.

Gentlemen, I now turn to the second question, that of Parliamentary Reform, with which, perhaps, more than any other my name has been connected: connected too in a way which has drawn upon me much popular observation, and often much popular obloquy. They much mistake me who suppose that I impute to the supporters of Reform a perfect knowledge of what the principles which they advocate would lead to. No! Gentlemen, it is with their doctrines I quarrel, and I now wish, as I have ever done, to discuss those doctrines *argumentatively*, and not vituperatively. I wish those persons who cry out for Reform, to state to me, to state to themselves, distinctly the objects they have in view, and their means of attaining those objects. Do they ground their necessity for Reform upon the fact of our having been engaged in expensive wars, our having been engaged in long and protracted struggles on the Continent? Do they advocate it on the ground of heavy taxation and

severe legislative enactments? Supposing these their grounds for Reform, and granting for argument sake that they are true, then, I ask, is it *by the House of Commons alone that these acts have been sanctioned?* Do they charge them as the acts of a single body? Has no sanction or confirmation been given by another Assembly to those enactments? If there be another Assembly co-operating with the House of Commons, then, I say, a Reform of the House of Commons is nugatory, *without a co-ordinate Reform of that other body also?* (cheers.) I put this plain question, and I have never yet met the man who would answer it *satisfactorily*. If you reform the House of Commons, pray what are your intentions with respect to the House of Lords? (applause.) If you wish a Reform on the ground of the House of Commons having sanctioned the war with America; if you wish for a Reform on the ground of the House of Commons having sanctioned the war with France, sinking for a moment the fact that war with America was the *war of the people*, sinking the fact that the war with France was the *war of the nation*. If you wish for Reform, because at a later period the House of Commons found it necessary to pass severe enactments for the repression of dangerous disturbances, then I ask, are the House of Lords, who were parties to these transactions, to go free? If not, then I ask, what is the remedy you propose? And, if you propose no remedy for the House of Lords, where is the benefit of reforming the House of Commons? Do you mean to prevail by reason or by compulsion? If by reason, then reason is as good out of doors as in. Is it by compulsion? Aye, that is what you mean, but what you do not dare to say (loud cheers). Why, then, my quarrel with Reformers is not as to the mode of or the degree; I take an objection, *in limine*, that they ask that, instead

of a tripartite Government, there should be erected a *simple instrument* which would do its own work by sweeping off every obstacle and impediment which stood in its way. This is my objection to the proposed Reform. I do not object to it because Old Sarum returns one, or two, or twenty Members to Parliament. I don't object to it because it would prevent this or that Peer from exercising his influence in returning Members for Boroughs. For God's sake, if you can prove corruption in any Borough, disfranchise it as you have disfranchised Grampond. But if by the Representatives of the People you mean *the organ of the nation* (and much confusion has arisen from misunderstanding and confounding terms), then I ask, when the nation has *its organ*, what room is there for any thing more?

This is "discussing the question *argumentatively*" is it? This you call *argument*. It is, to be sure, less of the jack-pudding cast than that which I shall come to by-and-by; but what is there here more than a mere *disfiguring* of the question; a mere keeping of the real question out of sight? Our complaint is this: "The people are not *represented*: they have shown by their petitions, that the Aristocracy, and not the Commons, send a majority of the members to the Lower House." And, what is your answer to this complaint? We further complain, that this representation of the Aristocracy has produced a want of feeling for the

Commons, and has led to that taxation under which the country is suffering. This is the substance of our complaint: and, what is your answer? It is this; that it is not the House of Commons *alone* that makes the laws; but that and the House of Lords *conjointly*; and, therefore, a reform of the former can be of no use *without a reform of the latter*.

Here you think, that, having *Six-Acts* before our eyes, you *pin us up*. Making sure that we *dare not answer*, you call on us to answer, as Southey and Gifford did on me as soon as the gagging and dungeoning bills were passed. Making sure, that we dare not say a word in answer, you go crowing on, that you put this "*plain question*" to us: "*What do you mean to do with the House of Lords?*" You have never yet, you say, *met with a man* to give you an answer to this question. You are particularly lucky just at your going off, then; for, now you have met with the very man that you have been so long looking for in vain; and this is the answer to your plain question: **WE MEAN TO REFORM THE HOUSE OF LORDS TOO.** There now! There is an answer for you, though you were so cock-sure, that no one *dared* give it you.

And, now, I will describe to you the *sort of Reform* that we would effect in the House of Lords. Mr. Grey, now Lord Grey, presented, in 1793, a petition, which stated that a majority of the members of the Lower House were returned to it by the Upper House, and by a few men closely connected with those of the Upper House. We would take away from the Upper House the power of doing this; and, as this is directly in the teeth of the "*law*," which you say is "*so binding*," we should call this *reform of the House of Lords* not only a legal, but a moral reform.

Aye, but you have a *tickler* in soak for us. We must change *the way of acting in the Lords*. That is we must *prevail* on the House of Lords to act *differently* from the manner in which *they act now*; or else we do nothing, they being a body without whom the other House *can now do nothing*. Then comes your tickler: "Do you mean to prevail by *reason*, or by *compulsion*? If by *reason*, then reason is *as good out of doors as in*. Is it by *compulsion*? Aye, that is what *you mean*, but what *you dare not say*."

Impudent mountebank! What do you mean by *reason* being as

good out of doors as it is in? Do you mean, that, unless the House of Lords be absolutely *forced* to act thus, or thus, by the House of Commons, the people may as well have *no representatives at all*? This, if any, must be your meaning; and, then, why is there a thing called a House of Commons? Yours is a very good argument for getting rid of a House of Commons altogether; but, good for nothing else.

The basis of your argument is this: that the House of Lords, when deprived of the power of returning a majority to the other House, would have a *disposition*, and would be *constantly endeavouring*, to do *just the same as if it retained that power*. You do not seem to perceive, that it is *the possession of that power*, which, and which alone, *creates and sustains* the disposition to do those things which we say ought not to be done. Take away that power, the disposition ceases; or, at least, if it exist in some degree in the breast, it is restrained from breaking out into flagrant acts; a restraint that you may call "*compulsion*;" and, so far are we from "*not daring*" to avow that we *mean to prevail* by this species of compulsion, that we look upon those as idiots that

expect to prevail in any other way.

What is *compulsion*, in this application of the word? Why, restraining men from doing certain things, or causing them to do certain other things, against what may *naturally enough be their inclination*. And, is not this necessary in all ranks and states of life? Are we not all under the constant *compulsions* of the law? Is not the King himself under *compulsion* as to his marrying, and as to many other things, with regard to which he *naturally enough* might wish to be free? What the devil, then, is this House of Lords, that it must experience *compulsion* of no sort whatever? What the devil is it, that we should "*not dare say*," that we would wish to see an efficient restraint, or check, upon its actions, which actions affect our very lives?

Yours appears to be a pretty idea of a "*tripartite*" Government. There is one body (out of the three), which, according to you, must have *no check upon it at all*; or must be *destroyed*. If the Commons have a House of *their own*, the Lords, according to you, *must be nothing*. The thing must be *one*, or nothing. This is your doctrine. Why, then are we put to the expense of *what is called a House of Commons*? How is it, that the *Senate*, in the American Congress, exists

along with a *House of Representatives*? These bodies frequently differ from each other; *frequently throw out each other's Bills*; are a *constant check* upon each other; act *compulsively* upon each other; and yet they not only co-exist, but proceed in the dispatch of business with the greatest regularity and dignity, and they manage the affairs of a country equalled by none in point of happiness and obedience to the laws. Will you say, that the *Senate is nothing*, because the Lower House is chosen *more frequently*, and *directly* by the *people at large*? Why not call this Lower House the "*organ* of the nation;" why not call it a "*simple instrument*;" why not say, that the nation, having *that*, can have *nothing more*? This is really a "*tripartite*" Government. Here are a President, a Senate, and a House of Representatives, all deriving their authority from different descriptions of suffrage; checking and acting compulsively towards each other occasionally; and yet all existing in the greatest harmony. But, if the Senate, who really represent the Aristocracy of America, put, of their own will, a majority into the Lower House, would it be then a "*tripartite*" Government? No: it would be an *Oligarchy*; an "*Organ*," a "*simple instrument*:" just that sort of thing that you appear to be so much *afraid of*! In England the Chief Magistrate and the Upper House are *hereditary* instead of being *elected by the Aristocracy*. That would be all the difference in the two cases if our *Commons*, or *People*, had the choosing of the House that is

called theirs. But you can see nothing but *open war* between the Houses, if one of them were chosen by the people! If the Commons' House WERE the Commons' House, you think that the "*tripartite Government*" must cease! Unless the Lords choose the Members of the other House, you can see no hope of preserving the Lords! In short, unless two of the parts be *one*, you can see no hope of preserving a *Three-part-Government*!

Why, you silly as well as impudent mountebank, had you the vanity to think, that no one would "*dare*" to answer you? Did you think, that your vapourings on the Liverpool stage too were protected by *Six-Acts*? Did you forget, that it was not yet *banishment* to laugh at what passed in that scene of unparalleled meanness, froth and impudence?

Having given you the "*answer*," you were so much in need of, I might, but I will not, pass over a falsehood, introduced into the above passage parenthetically. I allude to your assertion, that the *people* were for the old American War and for that against France. What *ground* have you for this assertion? The proof of the contrary is found in the innumerable *petitions against the American War*; and, as to the war against the people of France, Oh! impudent mountebank! Is not the lie given to you by the proclamations, the acts, the unparalleled severities, to keep the people from actually rising in open rebellion against the undertaking and the carrying on of that war! Was not the Habeas Corpus Act suspended for seven years during that war? But, is it not notorious,

nay, is it not your *boast*, that the object of the war, and the sole object, at the outset, was to put down *French principles in England*? Is not this as well known, as it is that you were Ambassador in Portugal with a salary of fourteen thousand a-year out of our taxes? And who, then, but you would have had the brass to call that war a *war of the people*?

The next portion of your speech relates to the laudable efforts now making by Mr. FAWKES in Yorkshire.

"This question of Reform is pressed more immediately upon my attention, from the circumstance of a Gentleman in a neighbouring County—a Gentleman of fortune, of character, and of great talents, of whom I wish to speak with great respect, having thought proper recently to rake up the *dying embers* of this unhappy question; on which occasion he did me the honour to refer to some opinions delivered by me in another place. Mr. Fawkes, the gentleman to whom I allude, and whose name I mention with honour, thought proper to express his surprise that I, the representative of the opulent and commercial town of Liverpool, should express any anxiety about such close boroughs as Old Sarum. Perhaps I might in return express my surprise that Mr. Fawkes, who commenced his exertions for reform by clamouring about the inadequate representation of his own county of Yorkshire, should, now that the representation of that county had been doubled, discover that a reform was *more than ever necessary* to the welfare of the country (cheers). Had I a grievance to complain of, it would be that which has for such a length of time been dinning in my ears, I mean the complaints of the county of Yorkshire, who, like Niobe and

her numerous offspring, wept her unhappy fate, and now that she had been gifted with two more helpmates, seeing her unhappy son coming forward to lament the violation of public liberty and the destitution of England (cheers). Surprise for surprise. But I shall turn the Gentleman's surprise to conviction. It is *just because* I am the representative of the second town in the kingdom, that I advocate the cases of smaller boroughs. I have no hesitation in declaring, that were I the representative of Old Sarum, I should have held my tongue; but it is because I could not be suspected of having a *shadow of interest in the question*, that I felt it my duty to say that which, if said by others, might be imputed to *questionable motives*. I did so, because I was anxious to expose the fallacy of those doctrines, which, while they pretended to remove the blots and scandals of the constitution, contained principles which would go to change the whole nature of the institution itself. Let any reformer show me that he is *only anxious to remove those blots which exist, and I am with him*; but the doctrine of reform goes further—it goes not to alter the mode, *but the thing*—it would have the effect of altering those institutions which combined *all the industry, all the property, and which opened a door to all the talent of the country* (cheers.) Let us beware, Gentlemen, of allowing the introduction of a system which would *act by power and not by reason*—which would govern by authority and not by that salutary conflict of opinions and of interests which at present exists—a system which to act at all must act *alone*. It is because I feel this that I find it necessary to oppose Reform."

"*Niobe*," indeed! you poor jester! Where has Mr. FAWKES said, that Reform is now "*more necessary than ever*" to York-

shire, or to any other part of the country? If you must *jest*, hatch the subject yourself, and do not father it on others. But, what a vapid coxcomb, to suppose, that we should look upon you as *really chosen by Liverpool!* "No interest," have you, in supporting *Old Sarum!* Just as if we did not know, that, if it were not for the power of the rotten Boroughs, *your face could never have been shown in Liverpool!* Just as if we did not know, that it was the expenditure caused by the rotten Boroughs, that gave you your seat. And, as to your being anxious to *remove blots*, we know how sincere you *at* be, when we recollect, that, when evidence of Castlereagh's *actually selling a seat* was offered to be produced at the bar of the House, you voted against hearing that evidence, on the ground that "*a stand ought to be made against democratical encroachment.*" To produce *proof of seat-selling* you called "*democratical encroachment.*" You would not hear the tendered evidence; you called those who wished for inquiry "*a low degraded crew;*" and now you wish us to believe, that you are "*anxious to remove blots!*" Yes, after the manner of "*Gram-pound;*" that is to say, a mode of Reform, which would wheedle the nation along in its present state *for ever*; a mode which would, as you say, *not alter the thing*; a mode, which, under the name of *Reform*, would *preserve the corruption unimpaired*. The close of the passage last quoted treats us to a repetition of your assertion about the "*simple instrument;*" but, I have answered that before.

This is your favourite hit, and you return to it again when you come to speak of the *influence of the Crown*; but now you come to the new doctrine about the *power of the press*, which is worthy of particular notice, because it has lately been held forth, not only as something sufficient to weigh against all the influence of rotten Boroughs, but as something that renders it necessary to pass new laws, laying the most odious restraints upon the people.

Gentlemen, it has been said that the influence of the Crown operates so powerfully in the House of Commons that it perverts all its decisions. My first answer to that proposition is that which I have already given. *How rarely do we find the House of Lords differing from the House of Commons*, and what is the cause of this? Is it that the influence of the Crown operates on the House of Lords also? Take either alternative. If it is so, then I ask will you *reform the House of Lords also*? And what is the nature of the Reform which you propose? If it is not so, will you derange the whole machinery of the Constitution by placing the whole power at the disposal of *a single body*? But nothing can be more false than to suppose that the influence of the Crown has increased comparatively with the growth and strength of public opinion. That it has increased numerically in the House of Lords or House of Commons I deny. Any man who has watched the progress of the Constitution must have observed in the moral as in the physical world, great powers at work, which require the steady hand of authority to direct and control them. What, Gentlemen, would you say to that philosopher who, in sitting down to write on the theory of winds and tides, and to give a history of navigation, should omit to describe

that new and mighty power (new at least in its application) which walks upon the waters with a giant's strength; which approximates distant countries and creates near neighbourships; which gives to the fickleness of the winds, and the faithlessness of the waves, all the certainty and security of a journey by land [cheers]? Would you not set him down as an ignorant, unobservant, and idle spectator? a man whose mind was so cramped as not to perceive that the omission to notice the power of steam had routed all his calculations, and evinced his ignorance of that of which he professed to treat? So would it be of an historian who, in attempting to describe the British Constitution, were to say that the Crown had a veto which it seldom exercised; that the House of Commons had the power of withholding supplies which it never enforced, but who omitted to notice *that mighty power of public opinion which was guided and directed by the public press*. Such an historian would only prove his own confined knowledge, and his utter incompetency for the task he had undertaken. I say, Gentlemen, that in all countries, in order to keep that standing which it is fit should stand, care must be taken not to admit any partial breach on the foolish faith that nothing which has not been calculated upon will enter. Another test which I apply to all speculative schemes of state policy, is, to inquire how they will operate for the benefit of the community in which we live? In private life I always look with jealousy and caution to that diffused generosity which, neglecting its domestic circle, pretends to act for the general benefit of mankind. In looking around me I find Great Britain a monarchy, founded on establishments which bind and control it; but still essentially a monarchy, which I, as a loyal subject, am bound to support. I do

not think it fit to enter the lists in order to show why it is, or why it should be a monarchy. I do not feel bound to show, *a priori*, why the Government of England is a monarchy, any more than I am to show why England itself is an island. Sufficient for me that I find it so—that it has from generation to generation been commented upon, but not altered: that I now find it existing, and that I owe allegiance to the *Constitution under which I was born* [cheers]. I know how stale this doctrine will appear to those who wish to inquire, not what ought to be done under existing circumstances, but what they would do were every thing to begin again. I wish not to become a philosopher from the beginning of the world by being a bad subject in the age in which I live [cheers]. I say that a popular assembly, according to the reforming principle, would laugh at Monarchical Government, and would be essentially a republic. I shall not now inquire whether a republican form of government would be better than the present. I feel myself bound by the laws—

"Spartan nactus es hanc exorna."

Improve the Constitution as much as you can, but when an attempt is made to renew it, *I feel myself bounded by the law*, and I agree with the law in preference to the theory [cheers]. I remember a story told of a certain King of Bohemia, who was most anxious to become a great naval power, but unfortunately for his ambition, a great obstacle presented itself, which was, that he had not a seaport in his dominions [cheers and laughter]. I feel myself in the same situation with his Majesty of Bohemia: when a republican assembly is spoken of, *I find I am not free to choose*, for I have a monarchy and an aristocracy in my eye (cheers).

Let the *King of Bohemia* pass

from your stage into Joe Miller without interruption. Let the happy agreement between the Lords and their relations and friends pass along with his inland Majesty; and let your being "*bounded by the ancient law*," while you were helping to pass *Six Acts*, go in company with them. But, as to the press, this famous thing that is to compensate us for the loss of suffrage and for all other losses and wants connected with our political rights, I must say a word. "The mighty power of public opinion, guided and directed by the *public press*." This is, it seems, our protection against all that the King and the Parliament can do! You seem to think, that we do not happen to know, that about seventeen twentieths of this press is in the actual pay, or under the influence, of those who possess the Boroughs; that the press is their abject slave; that it is a mere tool in their hands; that you yourself had the principal management of the Anti-Jacobin, which was set up with public money; that the *SUN* and *TRUE BRITON* were set up in the same manner, and that the latter paper was, in 1800, offered to me by an under Secretary of State. You seem to think, that the public do not happen to know any thing about Gifford, Southey, Stoddart, Walter, Stewart, Heriot, the Quarterly Review, the Gentleman's Magazine, the Tract Societies, the "Christian Knowledge" Societies, and all the swarm of writing reptiles and of publications in the service of the possessors of Boroughs.

But, if the "*public press*" be our *all*, what are we to think of the laws passed to crush it? And,

what are we to think of you, who, during the jocund season of *Six-Acts*, defended every harsh proposition, and expressed your hope of seeing "*that accursed torch of discord extinguished for ever*," meaning *the almost only publication*, which was calculated to open the eyes of the people to the true state of their affairs? If the "*public press*" be such a great thing for us, look at the *forty-two acts* which have been passed, within these thirty years, for the purpose of cramping it, and making it the slave of power. Look at *Sidmouth's Circular*; look at the Act that compels the printer to give *bail even before he begins to print*; look at the act which loads this very Register with *paper and price*; and look at that other act, which exposes to *banishment for life* any one who may utter any thing having a *tendency to bring into contempt* the passers of these acts! Impudent as we all know you to be, we could scarcely, without these things before our eyes, have believed you impudent enough to assert that we stood in no need of Reform *because the press was become so free*. Corruption, in all her works; has been no where so successful as with the *press*. This has been the most powerful of all her means, except those *tranchant* means that I need not minutely describe. Had it not been for that corrupt press, of which the *Anti-Jacobin* newspaper formed a part, never could this kingdom have been in its present state. It is this very press that has brought us to behold miseries such as no nation on earth ever beheld before; and of which miseries you, in conclusion of the reform-part

of your speech, talk, wretched jester, in the following style:—

Even within the limits of our own time, it is singular to observe the various modes in which Reform has been advocated. Six years ago great and oppressive calamities befel the country. The *price of corn became high*, and food became so dear that it was unattainable by the lowest classes of society. What was the *remedy* proposed then? *Parliamentary Reform*: Parliamentary Reform was pointed out to the suffering people *as a remedy for every grievance*. They were told that the great landholders had passed the Corn Bill, and that the only remedy left was to *put down those tyrannical landholders*, which could be effected only by Parliamentary Reform. Well, the times are come round, the *markets are glutted*, the people are feeding in comfort and affluence; we see the happy effects of this in the *steady employment of labour* at something of a reduced rate of wages certainly, but still more than sufficient to procure the necessities of life; we see it in the *reduction of poor's rates*, and in the *diminution of crime*. It would be rather hard, if those who, seven years ago, thought the country ruined, and declared the Parliament good for nought for having passed the Corn Bill, who saw the increase of crime consequent upon the *scarcity*; it would be rather hard, I say, if they did not sympathise in that prosperity which had grown out of the reverse of what they had complained of. (Laughter). Well, *low prices came*, and landlords became distressed, and what was then the remedy? *Parliamentary Reform again* (laughter); so that by a Parliamentary Reform they were to *restore the good old times of 1817*, which times a Parliamentary Reform had been called for to remedy. (Laughter). I do not wish to under-rate either evil; God forbid I should. In both there is much which I la-

ment and could wish to cure, but as to a Reform in Parliament *curing both*, I leave to the judgment of any man who has seen it prescribed as a specific for such opposite evils. Reform is prescribed as a *panacea for every thing*. I remember having a short time since somewhere read of an artist who had attained considerable eminence in painting, but who for some unaccountable reason confined himself to one branch of his art, that of painting a red lion. (Laughter). He was employed by the landlord of a public-house, for whom he painted a red lion, in such excellent style, as considerably raised his professional reputation, and he was in consequence sent for by a gentleman, who showed him a large pannel in his parlour, upon which he wished to have some painting executed. The artist, after grave consideration, recommended that the vacant pannel should be filled up with a large red lion (laughter), and a large red lion was accordingly painted. In a short time after, he was called upon by a neighbour in more humble circumstances, who had a small pannel in which he wished to have painted a landscape, or some pretty trifle in water colours. The painter opposed this plan, and warmly urged that, in order to produce a pleasing effect, the pannel should have depicted on it a small red lion. (Cheers and laughter). This is the case with the advocates of Reform, in whatever direction you meet them, and the most you can get from the most moderate of them is, that they will introduce only the *small red lion*. (Laughter). Gentlemen, I wish these things were only entertaining; but there is mischief in them, and the country must be on its guard; for, believe me, if the small red lion once gets in, he will only be a precursor to the whole menagerie (cheers), and we shall have not only to turn him out as he came in, but as he will have

grown when pampered and fed in his cage. (Laughter).

Laughter: Yes, and the reptiles would have laughed, if you, as Casca says of Cæsar, had "cut their mothers' throats." But, who besides these mean and greedy hounds would have "*cheered*" a scurvy jest like this, when they saw hundreds of thousands of people *actually starving, in the midst of plenty*, only on the other side of the narrow channel that divided them from the native land of the jester who was operating before them?

What; did we, in our petitions of 1817, pray for Reform *in order to make corn low-priced*? Do we now pray for it, *in order to make corn high-priced*? Do we now pray for it, in order to see "*re-stored the good old times of 1817!*" Thou impudent mountebank! Thou jack-pudding of the Liverpool stage! Thou at once the most impudent and most mean of all creatures, when did we pray for any of these things? You are a pretty fellow to be the "*leader*" of a legislative assembly! Go: away with you! This alone shows that you could never be tolerated. Mr. PEEL is, at any rate, no jack-pudding: no "*Mr. Merryman*:" he may be, and he will be, unable to suggest any remedy without a Reform of the Parliament; but we shall not, as we read his speeches, figure to ourselves a fellow with ruddled cheeks and jacket with buttons as big as plum-cakes.

I shall, by-and-by, have to show how *Reform is connected with the state of the country*. But, I must first notice your little side-wind dissertation on our *foreign politics*.

3. **POLICY WITH REGARD TO FOREIGN NATIONS.**—This is a very curious part of your performance, and I beg the public attention to it.

"This subject becomes the more important, when we consider that in the age in which we live there exists in some countries an open, and in others a secret struggle against monarchy and aristocracy—*God be praised we have not our part to take in such a struggle—God be praised we have already derived all the benefit which can be derived from the conflict, and therefore it is our duty not to side in the assault with those who ask too much, or with those who will grant nothing. We ought not to stimulate either party, we ought to stand upon a firm basis as spectators interested in the contest, and perhaps ultimately the umpire.* But if we prematurely make ourselves a party, we shall lose the commanding position which we hold; we shall also lose the power of doing much good, and perhaps run the risk of having our own institutions not altered but overthrown." (Cheers.)

Now, if this be sound and good, what was that which was held forth to us in the case of the *French War*, or, rather, the war against the French people, and for the restoration of the Bourbons, the Pope and the Inquisition? Oh! but, "we have *already derived all the benefit which can be derived from the conflict.*" Yes; *eight hundred millions of debt in one shape; and about a hundred millions in another shape (the dead charge!)* And, besides these, a standing *live charge* of about ten millions a-year for army and other things. These are the "*benefits*" which we have "*already derived from the conflict.*" What other benefits may be in reserve, I cannot

say; but this I well know, that it has already cost *all this to prevent Reform*; and this is now the general opinion, and will remain to be the general opinion, in spite of all that can be said or done by you and all the rest of the political mountebanks.

"*Umpire!*" We the Umpire! Do you hear of *any people appealing to us?* The first step even of *Portugal*, a sort of province of England, was to chase away all Englishmen in authority, and to show, in the most marked manner, a resolution not to suffer us to show our noses in their concerns. In the several countries where there has been, or is, a struggle for freedom, there have been divers projects of government on foot, and in many cases foreign aid has been sought; but, in no one instance has there been a single projector to propose an imitation of your "*tripartite Government,*" and in no one instance has there been an application to that Government for aid. Oh, no! The nations of the world know too well what your "*tripartite*" is. It is "*as notorious as the sun at noonday,*" and the nations cast it from them; keep it out, as they would the yellow fever or the plague.

4. **DISTRESS OF THE COUNTRY.**—On the day of your great *benefit*; the day of your *last performance*, you said nothing upon this subject, though it was one to which a would-be "*leader*" might have been expected to allot a considerable portion of his remarks. Upon the minor stage, however, the "*Little Theatre*" of your *Club*, you made this distress a part of your performance; and, a

very pretty part it was, as we are now going to see.

Gentlemen, you embodied yourselves at a time when the country was in great difficulties, both at home and abroad.—The councils to which we gave our cordial support have gloriously surmounted the external difficulties; and surmounted them not as those who were then opposed to us recommended—by compromise, by trucking, or by a mere accidental lucky escape, but by perseverance, by *steadiness*, by *confidence* in ourselves, in our country and our cause, by a triumph *without example*, as our exertions were without precedent or parallel. Unfortunately, great efforts are not to be made without great sacrifices, and as the overstrained exertion of the political as well as of the *physical body*, produces *lassitude* and *exhaustion*; unfortunately, the conclusion of our dangers from without was followed by internal dangers, which if not more difficult to overcome, were equally more *painful to combat*. In combating such dangers, we were animated by none of the feelings which sustained us during the conflict with the foreign foe; we felt that we were at war with those who ought to have been our *fellows in sentiment* as in country; and our triumph was *painful in its execution*, though *just and merciful in its purpose*. Long may those over whom it was achieved share, in peace and tranquillity, the benefit of its achievement! I would fain hope, indeed, Gentlemen, that we have no more such struggles, no more such triumphs to apprehend. Looking abroad through Europe, I see no near prospect of a call upon this country for any foreign exertion. At home, I do not disguise from myself that I see great difficulties and great distress, but I see those difficulties and that distress in quarters where education and intelligence may be expected to counteract intem-

perance of feeling, to correct prejudice, and to discountenance faction. The suffering was, *ere while*, in those classes of society with whom suffering naturally begets impatience, and absorbs reflection, and delivers over the sufferer, in pardonable and pitiable delusion, a prey to every designing demagogue who points out resistance as a remedy. It exists now, I am grieved to acknowledge, in higher classes of society, not less entitled to sympathy, not less objects of compassion, and, where practicable, of relief; but who know that their safety, as well as their prosperity, is bound up with the peace of the kingdom; and who, when they are satisfied that the privations which they now endure are such as neither laws nor governments can cure, will be cautious not to lend their authority to any schemes, which, under pretence of alleviating present and partial evils, may lead to the disturbance of their country. I am confident, that, having, during a great struggle of so many years, preached patience to the humbler classes of the community, the higher will not now desert their duty, by refusing, in their turn, to practise the same degree of patience which has been generally displayed by those beneath them. For, Gentlemen, apart from the interests of separate classes, we have all a common interest in the conservation of that order of things which is the security of the whole. We must feel, I am sure, and none feel more than those whom I am addressing, that it would be a peevish and unthinking spirit, which, under the irritation of a temporary inconvenience, should quarrel, not with the immediate sources of immediate suffering, but with all that surrounds them, with all that is contemporary with them, with passive circumstances as well as with active causes; as a child, in its anger, beats the ground, because for a moment it has fallen. To maintain to our native land that

supremacy which it has long exercised, we must look to the maintenance of its institutions; and if, in a moment of uncomfortable pressure, we lay hold, in anger, on those established institutions, and shake them to ruin, we may be perfectly sure, that, while we procure *no remedy for the evil that assails us*, we shall take from our posterity, probably from ourselves, the *means of safety* as well as the hope of reparation.

This is quite enough to convince any man of sense, that you are wholly unfit to have any hand in conducting the affairs of this country. It shows, that you know nothing at all, that you can know nothing at all, about them; and, of course, that you would be a sad load upon the shoulders of a Ministry, who, if they, even without any such load, get out of the present mess, or even stagger along in it for another year, without being buried alive, will deserve to be ranked amongst the cleverest fellows that ever walked on the face of the earth; and God only knows how far that is from being their true character! We have here quite enough to convince any man of sense, that you cannot be *in place*; that is to say, here, at home. In place, somewhere or other, you will be, as long as the system last, unless you be absolutely kept out by *physical force*. But, this dissertation on distress is conclusive as to the impossibility of your being in place at home; or, at least, in any place that would expose the Ministry to the risk of your *opening your mouth* in the House of Commons. If the *licence-fellows* and *place-hunters* at Liverpool continued to return you (and they would as long as there were pickings) your col-

leagues must absolutely muzzle you, or prepare for making their exit from Whitehall; and that they certainly would not do without many and many a broken heart-string.

But, now, let us look at this "*statesman-like*" thing a little in detail; beginning with the "*triumph*" of the late war. This triumph was, you say, "*without example*;" and so it was; for it cost a *thousand millions of Taxes* during war, and it has left the nation loaded with *six hundred millions of 'Change Alley Debt*, contracted during the war, with a *hundred millions of Dead Charge Debt*, with a *hundred millions of Poor-rate Debt*, and with about *two hundred millions of Live Charge Debt*. This is what "*the triumph*" cost; and, therefore, it certainly was a triumph "*without example*." You say, that "*the triumph*" was obtained by "*steadiness*" and by "*confidence*." That is to say, by *steadiness in borrowing* and never paying; and by *confidence in the force of money*; for by money it was, and by money only, that "*the triumph*," which was a triumph over England, and not over France, was obtained.

"*Unfortunately*:" what! Can any thing *unfortunate* have come out of this "*triumph*?" We shall hear. Yes: "*unfortunately*," "*great efforts and over-strained exertions* are followed by *lassitude and exhaustion* in the political as well as in the physical *body*." So, then, there were *over-strained exertions*, though you had told the gaping blood-suckers, just before, that "*the triumph*" was obtained by *steadiness and confidence*. The crew that were listening to you know a

little something of commercial *over-straining*; *over-pulling*, or *drawing*; and they know, too, that it indicates any thing but "*steadiness and confidence*;" but that it, like your's, never fails to produce "*lassitude and exhaustion*;" only it always (except amongst mountebanks) produces the exhaustion *first* and the lassitude *afterwards*.

From this sickly stuff, you come to the *internal wars of 1817 and 1819*; and here you discover all that flippant insolence and that dunghill-cock boldness that have long secured to you so large a portion of public detestation. You and your crew (who now *toasted the Manchester Magistrates*) "*triumphed*" then, too, did you! You gained a "*painful triumph*:" it was "*painful in its execution and merciful in its purpose*." There only wanted *Oliver and Edwards*, one to sit on your right hand and one on your left. But, I do not know, indeed, that this was necessary. You must have been sure of your men, before you talked in this style.

You "*triumphed*" in 1817 and 1819. Your means were, the *Manchester Magistrates and Yeomanry*; the *Oldham Inquest*; *Oliver*; *Edwards*; the *Six-Acts*. These indicated that *merciful purpose* of which you have the insolence to talk. And, as to your own particular *mercifulness*, we have on record "*the revered and ruptured Ogden*," and the *loud laugh* with which it was received. That is *down* to your account. We have that as a proof of the *mercifulness* of your purpose. Your "*triumph*," that triumph of which you boast, was a triumph *over those laws*, which you now

affect to hold in such reverence; and enough of which will, I trust, be left, at last, for purposes not necessary to be particularly mentioned here. Your crew say, that you are going to be Governor-General of India; but, neither Swann, nor Knight, nor Dewhurst, nor any other of the victims of your "*triumph*" has, in my view of things, the smallest reason to *wish to change chances with you*; and, this I put down in black and white, that my words, like those with regard to Peel's Bill, may be *remembered*. I could now tell *your fortune* pretty nearly as accurately as I did the fortune of that Bill. When you once see the cliffs of England behind you, - - - - - But, let it be for the present. You will know all about it quite soon enough.

We now come to your "*Statesman-like view*" of the situation of the *Farmers and Landlords*; and here we shall see how fit you would be for a *Minister*. You comfort yourself by the reflection, that the *distress* is now amongst persons of "*education*," and not amongst those who are liable to be deluded by "*designing demagogues*." But, what is *education* to do for the sufferers? Will they bear beggary the better for having been *gentlemen*? Oh, no! This is not what you mean. You mean, that, being persons of *education*, they will see, that their own "*safety is bound up with the peace of the country*." In short, that they will not be *for Reform*; because they will see, that their sufferings, which are only *temporary and partial*, cannot be put an end to, or lessened, by *any thing that the Government can do*.

In the first place, you do not

appear to see, that the whole body of farmers must lose their capital, and the landlords their estates, unless the Government do something, and that quickly too. Not seeing this, it is no wonder that your head runs upon the dangers that the great would run the risk of from Reform. The mass of proprietors and occupiers of land *must be ruined without Reform*; and you are talking to them of the dangers that *might* come with Reform. You are telling them that their "*safety is bound up*" with the present mode of going on, and they know, as well as you know what a salary of fourteen thousand a-year is, that their *certain ruin* is bound up with that same mode of going on. Tell them how they can get *rents*, or keep their *farm-stock* from the hands of the *Sheriff*. with wheat at 4s. a bushel: tell them that, and cease your unmeaning babble about "*safety bound up with the peace of the country*." They now know pretty well, that *their safety is not bound up* with '*Change Alley, the Dead Charge, the Live Charge, and Whitchall*.' They know, that they must be *unbound* from these, or some of these, or that they are all a herd of beggars; and that, in that case, "*the peace of the country*" will be of no great value to them.

It is useless (though they deserve it at *your* hands particularly) for you to *twit* them with the *patience* that "*they preached*" to the suffering millions. You can hardly refrain from *jesting* even here; and here you might employ it with some degree of *justice*, though your disposition to do it shows what a shallow thing you are. What is the amount of

all your exhortations to this great class of sufferers! What are you driving at, when you call upon them to be cautious how they sanction any thing that may "*lead to the disturbance of their country*?" What boots your solemn observation, that "*we have all a common interest in the conservation of that order of things which is the security of the whole*?" To what end is this sprouting of the potatoe; this palpable Irish Bull? It is the *disturbance in their pockets* that they are thinking about, and, though they know, that the present order of things is exceedingly good for *tax-eaters*, it is by no means good for them, and that "*we*," if such as you are put along with the landlords and farmers and traders and non-tax-eaters, have not a "*common interest*;" but, on the contrary, that the interests are directly opposed to each other; and, what is more, that, in their present state, the two descriptions of persons can *no longer co-exist*.

It is perfect nonsense, therefore, to talk, in such a case, of the classes in question being "*ruined*" by any "*shaking of the institutions*" of the country. They must be *ruined*, unless those things which you call *institutions* be shaken. They must be ruined; they are condemned to ruin, unless the *Debt* and the *Seat-selling* be shaken, and speedily and well shaken too; and as to what "*posterity*" would have taken from it by this shaking, it would certainly have *taken from it* about seven hundred millions of Debt, together with Six-Acts and a great number of other valuables provided for it and intended to be enjoyed by it as long as there

shall be a people called the English.

It is not stuff like this that can induce the owners of the land and of goods to refrain from wishing for *Reform*, if by no other means they can keep their land and their goods; and, if you cannot see, they can, *how it is that the rotten Boroughs take away their goods and estates*, an instance of which operation I will now give you, as a thing for you to *jest* upon at your next exhibition, if you should ever have another on the boards in this country. You say, that *Reform* will not raise prices. Empty Mountebank! Flippant Mr. Merryman! who ever said, or seemed to think, that it would? Who but knaves and fools ever wished for such rise? And, above all things, who ever said, or thought, or dreamed, that *Reform* would tend to produce such an effect? But, there was a thing, which we said *Reform* would do; namely, to *cause the taxes to be reduced*; to take off a large part of that 60 millions a-year, which is the cause of *all the distress*, in your country as well as in ours; for, you, in speaking in your flippant manner about the present *ease and happiness* of the *humbler classes*, seem to have wholly forgotten, that the people of whole parishes in your own country have been receiving the *extreme unction* in consequence of a total *want of food*, while corn and meat were daily shipped for that very country in prodigious quantities; you seem to have wholly forgotten that the best of all possible Parliaments had before it, at one and the same moment, a vote of money to relieve

the *starving people of Ireland*, and a Report recommending a vote of money to enable the Government to take English and Irish corn into pawn on account of its *over-abundance*; you seem to have forgotten all this completely, when you were jabbering away about the *ease and comfort and happiness of the humbler classes*.

The cause, and the only cause, of all the *distress*, in all the ranks of life, is, the 60 millions of taxes; and, a large part of these, we say, would be taken off by *Reform*, and never will, in that *large part*, be taken off without *Reform*. This is what we say; and, if we be told, that the taxes are wanted; that the expenditure which is now going on is *just and necessary*, we deny the assertion; we disprove it point by point, from the 'Change-Ally debt down to the Door-keepers at Whitehall. It would require volumes to exhibit in detail every instance of monstrous extravagance; but, we, now-and-then, take an instance; and, such an one I am going to take now.

Much of the squanderingings that have taken place, took place under pretence of a rise in the *price of provisions*. Now, Jack-Pudding, I am going to show, in a few words and a few figures, what will have more effect in producing a *Reform*, than would be produced against it by all that you could say, if you were to begin jabbling to-morrow, and go on to the end of your life. Mark, Mountebank: wheat, meat, all farm-produce, every article of it, is *lower priced now than in 1792*. Farmers and lay lords look at the following:

IN THE ORDNANCE :		Full Pay and Allowances in 1792.	Full Pay and Allowances in 1821.
Secretary to Board of Ordnance	- -	£ 510	£ 1695
Chief Clerk to Surveyor General	- -	437	1135
Assistant to - - Ditto	- -	200	825
Chief Clerk to the Clerk of the Ordnance	-	300	1035
Chief Clerk to the Principal Storekeeper	-	200	935
- - Ditto - - to Clerk of Delivery	- -	200	935
- - Ditto - - to Treasury	- -	200	737
- - Ditto - - to Board of Ordnance	- -	200	1125
Second Clerk to - - Ditto	- -	200	1177
Superintendent of Ordnance Shipping	- -	150	827
WOOLWICH :			
Storekeeper	- - - - -	160	700
Clerk of Survey	- - - - -	100	475
Ditto of Cheque	- - - - -	80	362
PLYMOUTH :			
Storekeeper	- - - - -	140	725
Clerk of Survey	- - - - -	120	475
Ditto of Cheque	- - - - -	100	292
FEVERSHAM :			
Storekeeper	- - - - -	150	575
Clerk of Cheque	- - - - -	90	362
GIBRALTAR :			
Storekeeper	- - - - -	182 10s.	725
Clerk of Survey	- - - - -	109 10s.	355
Ditto of Cheque	- - - - -	91 5s.	262

This is one of the ways in which the estates are taken from the Landlords, the farm-stock from the Farmers, and the goods from the Tradesmen! The above belongs to the *Live Charge*. Let us now take a specimen of the

"*Dead Charge*." And compare the *Full Pay* of 1792 with the *Retired Allowances* of 1821; these retired allowances being sums given to those who now do nothing at all.

	Full Pay, 1792.	Retired Allowances, 1821.
Chief Clerk to Clerk of Ordnance	£ 300	£ 900
Ditto - - Ditto Clerk of Deliveries	200	577
Ditto - - Ditto Principal Storekeeper	200	477
Plymouth Storekeeper	140	577
Sheerness Ditto	100	500
Waltham Abbey Ditto	150	400
Dover Ditto	120	333
Feverisham Ditto	150	320
Portsmouth Clerk of Survey	150	375
Plymouth - - Ditto	120	262
Waltham Abbey Ditto	—	300
Gravesend Clerk of Cheque	95 10s.	192
Sheerness - - Ditto	80	200

	Full Pay, 1792.	Retired Allowances, 1821.
Tower Clerks - - - - -	—	£ 350
Ditto - - - - -	—	453
Ditto - - - - -	—	320
Ditto - - - - -	—	412
Ditto - - - - -	—	333

To ask, whether man ever heard of any thing so monstrous as this before would be foolish; for, hundreds of things equally monstrous, equally an outrage to the feelings of the nation, have been pointed out by Mr. HUME. But I may reasonably ask (and I put it to almost any man on earth but you, Mountebank of Liverpool) whether this, or any thing like this, could be, if the House of Commons, who vote all the money, were chosen by the people at large; that is to say, by those who pay the taxes that are thus expended? And, impudent Mr. Merryman, do you think, that facts like these are to be driven out of the minds of the half-ruined farmers and landlords by your exhortations not to "*disturb the peace,*" or "*shake the institutions!*" How are they to see any danger, *to themselves*, in the reform that *you* are so much afraid of? They can easily enough see why it is that *you* are anxious about "*institutions*" like the above; but, they cannot so easily see how *their* "safety" is bound up with such "*institutions*;" or how they are to be "*ruined*" by the *shaking* of such institutions. They are seeking for something to prevent them from losing their last acre, their last head of stock and last package of goods. They see here how it is that these go away; and, whatever you may think of your talent at jesting, there will

require something more than jests to keep "*institutions*" like the above standing even only for one more year!

What I have shown would be enough; but, since my hand is in, and to come to close quarters with the rotten boroughs, and show the farmers how they take away their sheep and cows, I will give another instance. One of those sweet rotten things, to which you bear such an affectionate attachment, is called *Queenborough*; that is to say, the queen of all rotten boroughs. However, we shall see, that the "*freemen*" of this borough are persons of singular merit; for, of the *Members of the Corporation* (which is an "*institution*") all but one are in some office or other under, or have some money transaction with, *the Government*. There are, in this sweet borough, about three hundred "*freemen*," and of these and their sons and other relations, one hundred and ninety are in *public employ*. Amongst them they receive, in various ways, about 25,000*l.* a-year; but, one hundred and forty-seven freemen and eleven of their sons, receive, in salaries and allowances, nearly 20,000*l.* a-year!

This is the way in which we show how it is that rotten boroughs work to the destruction of the country. How singular it is (if I had time to go into another paper) to perceive that the ordnance hires almost all its vessels of free-

men of Queenborough. But, it is useless to deal in particulars: the whole thing is of a piece from the top to the bottom; and until it be altered by Reform of the Parliament, the estates of the landlords, the stock of the farmers, and the goods of the tradesmen, aye, and the wages of the labourer, must continue to be transferred to the tax-eaters of various descriptions, who now cover this land as the locusts did the land of Egypt. There is a Dead Charge, as it is called. This was the name given to it by mad and impudent Castlereagh; and, the world will hardly believe it; but, in the papers laid before the House, it is, as God is my judge, called the "DEAD WEIGHT!" Why, the bare use of a couple of such words, in such a case, is a disgrace to any thing calling itself a Government. However, this "Dead Weight" amounts to *better than five millions a-year.* Now do you think that there is any body in this nation; any farmer, any landlord, any tradesman, so great a fool as not to know, that the far greater part of this Dead Weight; and, perhaps, more than forty-nine fiftieths of it, arises from pay and allowances given to persons belonging, in some way or other, to the boroughs? One flagrant instance let me mention; and if that be not sufficient to make men demand Reform, they deserve to be scourged, not after the manner of Solomon, but after that of Rehoboam.

Amongst the half-pay officers are some, who have taken what they call *Orders*; that is to say, who have gone to the altar and declared, that they believe them-

selves called by the *Holy Ghost* to take upon them the administering of *Christ's word*, and also to take upon them the *care of souls.* The law says, that when once men do this, they can be *nothing* else than spiritual persons; that the character is indelible; that once a priest always a priest. Very well. Another maxim of the Government is, that the pay given to half-pay officers, is not to be considered as a remuneration for past services; but, and now mark me, jester, as a *retaining fee for future services.* This was the ground upon which Sir Robert Wilson was dismissed, and upon which a majority of the best of all possible Houses of Parliament, refused to inquire into his case. This was right. The King had a right to dismiss him at his pleasure. The half-pay is a retaining fee for future services; but, then, Liverpool Mountebank, how is it that these persons called by the *Holy Ghost* continue to receive the half-pay, though, according to law, it is *impossible for them to serve again?* How is this, Jack-pudding of Liverpool; and how is it that the best of all possible Parliaments almost laughed at Mr. Hume, when he wanted an inquiry into the matter? These persons called by the *Holy Ghost* make a part of this very Dead Weight, at the very time that they are as active as wasps in a grapiery, receiving surplice-fees and tithes.

There are the facts. I defy the world to match them, unless there be, in some other part of the world than this, that species of "tripartite" Government and that sort of boroughs to which you are so much attached. The few facts

that I have found room to introduce here, are sufficiently illustrative of those "institutions" about which you make such a prattle, and along with which you pretend that the interests of all classes of the community are what you call "bound up." I have here gone into particulars enough to show how a Reform of the Parliament would operate on the interests of the people, and how it would and must alter the situation of the country for the better. What hope do you hold out to persons in distress? Patience is your remedy, and this would be a remedy if time would work for them; but, as is evident to all but fools, time does and must work against them; and that the evils of every day must be greater than those of the day before, until the present race of landlords, farmers and traders, shall be completely destroyed; and that even then the curse will not stop, but will keep rolling on until the Government becomes the actual landholder in trust for the fundholder and for the other swarms who live upon the taxes.

5. YOUR APPROACHING EXILE.

—Such being the situation of the country, and such your crazy notions respecting it, what a pretty gentleman you would be, to be placed in the House of Commons, at such a time, as the organ of the Government! There requires in a person to fill that post, something like a due sense of the magnitude of the difficulty in the first place; and, in the next place, a sincere disposition to take or adopt measures calculated to cure a part, at least, of the evils; but in you, who have no remedy but patience; that is to say, a waiting for

complete destruction, what confidence is the country or even the House to have! The very *company*, in which we find you at Liverpool; the very spectators that surrounded your stage, would forbid us to hope for any thing rational from you. JOHN GLADSTONE, the Scotch chairman of the Canning Club, who bore his precious testimony to the expediency of Peel's Bill: this man has recently published a letter, in which he ascribes the distress of the landlords and farmers to over-production; and in which he beseeches them to adopt the remedy of sowing less seed, in order to get a smaller amount of crop! This, he says, would *make the price higher*; and so it would; but this wretched creature forgets that whatever sum were gained by the high price of the bushel of wheat, for instance, would, on the other hand, be lost by the diminution of the number of bushels; while, at the same time, the diminution must necessarily augment the poor-rates, increase the price of manufactured goods, and plunge the nation into all the evils of scarcity. To notice seriously any thing so monstrous as this would certainly be intolerable to my readers; but this is a specimen of the creatures by whom you were surrounded; this is a specimen of the men that can bestow praise upon you; and, there is, too, a fair enough presumption that you yourself hold the opinions of Gladstone, for every thing you do say upon the subject tends to the same monstrous absurdity.

Yet, you seem to think it hard that you are not chosen to be the leader of that House of Commons, which, in all human proba-

bility, will do a great deal towards deciding the fate of all men of property, during the very next Session. I will now take your canting, equivocating, whining and crying upon this subject.

“ When called to office, in 1816, I was called to a department perfectly alien from my official habits, and with the business of which I had no previous acquaintance; but, in the course of nearly five years’ diligent administration of that department, it has so happened that I am supposed, by those in whom *the law has vested the power* of appointing to the Government of India, to have qualified myself for the more immediate direction of that Government, over the concerns of which it has been my duty to exercise a distant superintendence. *Many obvious circumstances, undoubtedly, would have made it more agreeable to me to have remained in this country* [loud cheers]. I see around me more than one hundred and sixty motives for having so wished to remain [renewed cheers]. But, Gentlemen, I hold that a *public man* is, unless he can show cause of honour or duty to the contrary, bound to accept a trust, which he is selected as competent to administer for the public interest.—To an audience less enlightened, I should feel ashamed to enter thus far into the generalities, but our connection is one of principle, and to that only do I owe any claim to your attention. Whatever may be my future destination, it will be a consolation to me to reflect, that I have laid in your hearts the foundation of a most lasting regard [cheers]; and believe me, Gentlemen, that nothing shall efface from my mind the recollection of the many kindnesses I have received at your hands [cheers]. It may perhaps be thought necessary, after the speech of my Honourable Friend, and the allusions he has made to me, that I should offer a few words to you on topics connected with

the present affairs of the country, and to *the rumours* which have grown out of it. I cannot pretend to be ignorant of that part of those rumours which concern myself; but I have felt great difficulty in deciding, whether by passing them over in silence to incur the risk of being hereafter accused of having concealed from you something that I ought to have disclosed; or by alluding to them, to expose myself to the thousand misconstructions which beset every word spoken of himself by a person connected with active politics. I have decided upon braving the latter danger; because I am sure that no misconstruction nor inconvenience which I may bring upon myself by speaking the truth, can be so irksome to me as would be the suspicion, if ever hereafter it should be excited in your minds, that I had wilfully repaid your confidence with mistrust. Gentlemen, after this preface, I have nothing to say to you, except that I have really, and upon my honour, *nothing to tell*. I know nothing, I have heard nothing, more than *all of you*, Gentlemen, of any political arrangements likely to arise from the present state of things. It is not for me to presume that I should be in any degree concerned in such arrangements, nor to do any thing which should appear to imply such a presumption. I have, therefore, neither proposed to defer this meeting with my constituents, fixed, as you know, many months ago; nor have I suspended my preparations for departure; nor have I any ground, beyond those which lie open in common to me and to all the world, for apprehending that that departure is likely to be intercepted. It will not be expected of me that I should say any thing of what might, in a contrary supposition, be the decision which it would become me to form. I can only declare, with the most perfect sincerity, that such a decision would be formed by me upon an honest and impar-

tial review of public considerations alone, and would be determined, not by a calculation of *my interests*, but upon a balance of *my duties*. Gentlemen, enough of this topic, upon which I might still, perhaps, have hesitated to utter a word, if I had not been informed that my silence respecting it upon a former occasion *has been misinterpreted*. I trust I shall not now be misinterpreted the other way; and that having been understood as *ostentatiously adjuring office at home*, from not adverting to the possibility of its being proposed to me, I may not now be considered as, on the other hand, *expressing an anxiety for office*, by the, I hope, sufficiently measured allusion which I have found myself at last compelled to make to surmises of which I am not the author, but the object."

I have before noticed your mean overture of a compromise with regard to the *Catholic Emancipation*. The above passages are taken, the first from your speech at Gladstone's little theatre; and the other from that made upon Holinshead's greater stage. You appear to have thought, that you had not sufficiently explained yourself the first day; that is to say, eaten humble pie sufficiently, stooped low enough. You had been, I thought, upon your knees; but in this second speech, you come, Lucifer-like, belly on the ground.

However, let me go bit by bit through this matchless effusion of meanness. When "*called to office*," you say, in 1816. What do you mean by being *called*? We know, indeed, that the spiritual persons above-mentioned, and others of their cloth, are called: we know it, because they most solemnly declare it at the

altar. But we are got into a pretty state, indeed, if there is a race of beings who have *inward calls* to office, and with whom we are to be saddled for everlasting upon that ground; for, as to your having had any *outward call*: as to any body's having ever asked you to take a good fat post, let those believe that that like; or, rather that can, after your present begging and praying speech at Liverpool.

It "*happens*," does it, that you are supposed qualified to be Governor General of India. I believe that no such thing happens. I believe that the *reasons* for appointing you to India are quite as "*obvious*" (though they cannot be more so) as those circumstances "*which would have made it more agreeable to you to remain in this country*." Yes, much more agreeable to you, but much more agreeable to those that appointed you, that you should not stay in this country. Your sliding off into the "*one hundred and sixty motives*" (the number of the creatures you had around you) for wishing to remain is so much in the punning and play-actor style; smells so strongly of the green-room; that one cannot help exclaiming: what, the devil, was this man ever seated in a Cabinet by the side of a King!

You find it somewhat difficult to account for your having accepted an office, which is little more than that of Clerk or Agent to the East India Company, after having been a Secretary of State; and after having, in 1804, boasted that you had insisted upon the present Prime Minister being turned out of office, in which office you succeeded him. Do

you not remember this? I do; and I will warrant you that he has not forgotten it, whatever the newspapers may pretend upon the subject. You found it somewhat difficult to account for your having accepted this subaltern employment. We have, therefore, this doctrine conjured up: that you "hold that a *public man*" is, unless he can show cause of "honour or duty to the contrary, bound to accept a trust which he is selected as competent to administer for the public interest." Here is a good deal of qualification about honour and duty and public interest; but, what do you mean by a "*public man*?" Are we unhappy enough to have; are we, really, then, cursed with a breed of this sort of creatures? "Public man," indeed! Why are you a public man any more than any man that is hammering a tin-kettle or holding a plough? Why every man is a public man; but, shall it be said that every man is bound to take the public money, if any body that has the power to select him selects him for it? If any body were to go to Mr. Fawkes, for instance, and tell him that he was bound to have four or five thousand a-year for being Head Clerk to the East India Company, would not he laugh at the fellow? Honour, duty, public interest; how could any of these bind him to become a clerk? and, yet, is not he as much a public man as you? Plain English of this doctrine is, that you "*hold*" (and I will engage you will always hold) that it is right for you to get as much as you can; and that if you cannot get it in a high post you must get it in a low one. This is the plain

English of your *holding*; and stick to it you will as long as you have breath in your body.

It generally happens, that the second day's dish is inferior to that of the first day. This is the case here; for, though the first day was bad enough, the latter brought us something to exceed, in point of meanness, every thing ever heard of before as coming from a man having any pretensions to spirit or to talent. We see a pretended explanation; a pretended hearing of rumours; and this for the express purpose of telling, not the despicable creatures by whom you were surrounded on your Liverpool stage, but the Ministers at Whitehall, that you were ready to stay if they would but have you. You pretend that, the exhibition at the little theatre had left you to be "*understood as ostentatiously abjuring office at home*;" and therefore you wished to explain that you knew nothing of any new political arrangements, and that, "it would not become you to say what might be your decision in case of your being included in such arrangements." Never fear, man; never fear, Mr. Merryman! The man of the red lion will not be included in any such arrangements, whether he abjure office at home or not; that is to say, unless all the Ministers should be seized with a "mental delusion." The Ministers, by the good grace of His Majesty and by the greatest piece of luck that ever befel mortal men, have no longer *Sidmouth and Castlereagh* for us to harp upon. Freed from these; this load taken from their shoulders, can any thing short of downright staring madness induce them vo-

luntarily to incur the affliction of the Liverpool operator; whose every word still continues to be offensive to every one that does suffer, that has suffered, or that is likely to suffer distress of any kind or in any degree?

How are the Ministers to suppose that they are to conciliate the people by taking in amongst them the man that comes up reeking hot from boasting that he was one of those that "*triumphed*" over the the people in 1817 and 1819: that comes reeking hot from a club of wretches that had the audacity to *toast the Manchester magistrates*? If we look at your present doctrine of patience to the half-ruined landlords and the despairing farmers; if we reflect on your defence of the enormous retired allowances, and your calling them vested interests; or, if we remember your vapouring defence of Peel's Bill, in favour of which you called for an unanimous vote, and which you said settled the question for ever: whether, in short, we look at the present or the past, or calculate upon the future, where is the man, who, having his property dependent on the acts of the Government, would not be plunged into despair upon seeing you forming part of the Ministry? However, though it would be downright madness in the ministers, I am not sure it would not be *in the end*, beneficial to the nation that you should once more act your part at Whitehall. For my own part, in losing you, I shall lose one of my best subjects. You have been, for a great many years, not a standing dish, but a most delightful occasional repast. Here or there, no matter where, your career, such as it has been, draws

towards a close. When you bade the servile sots at Liverpool farewell, with good reason did you say that it was hard; for it was a farewell not only to their adulation, but to every thing of which you have been in the pursuit ever since your name was known to the public.

From the whole of your speech as far as it relates to yourself and your prospects, one would imagine, that there was some overruling necessity; some positive law, at least; some penal statute that compelled you, either to go to India or to fill some office of emolument at home. One would think there was something like fatality in your destiny; a sort of political predestination. I am aware of the existence of no such thing. If there be obvious reasons for your wishing to stay at home; we will say nothing about your *one hundred and sixty green-room retcons*: but if there be obvious reasons for your wishing to stay at home, why do you not stay at home? Aye, but then comes the other question, will they *give you a place at home*? Well, suppose they do not; cannot you stay at home without a place, as I do? I stay at home without having any place. To be sure, you and your colleagues did send me abroad, and the Magistrates in Lancashire put a man in prison for saying that I was come back in good health. But here I am. I am a *public man* as much as you, or else the devil is in it; and yet I stay here without any place, and live very happily in England. Why cannot you do the same? As to want of employment, where is there a prettier spinner of paragraphs and

epigrams in this country or in any other ! Why, your King of Bohemia and your Red Lion would be worth, each of them, half - a - crown and more too, as far as I know, at the offices of any of the morning papers. I am a wretched hand at paragraphs and puns and epigrams compared to you, and yet, you see, I do very well. They knock me down ; I get up again : they tread me under foot, drag me in the kennel, and out I come again as fresh as a rose. I have been *destroyed* fifty times, at the least ; and yet, you see, I am as much a

corporeal being as ever. Why cannot you do the same ? Why run whining and crying after place ; when experience has taught you what you can do in our way ! You were, beyond all comparison, the most lively newspaper writer in England. In short, stay with us ! Bid us good night, if you like, but do not repeat that "cruel, cruel word, farewell."

I am,

Mr. Merryman,

Your most obedient servant,

WM. COBBETT.